

EXECUTIVE SEC	ETARIAT
ROUTING	SLIP

TO:		I	ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL		
		DCI		X				
	2	DDCI		X				
	3	EXDIR						
	4	D/ICS						
	5	DDI	Χ					
	6	DDA						
	7	DDO			<u> </u>			
	8	DDS&T						
	9	Chm/NIC						
	10	GC						
	11	IG						
	12	Compt			ļ			
	13	D/OLL			ļ			
	14	D/PAO			_			
	15							
	16	VC/NIC						
	17	NIO/SP		X				
	18	C/ACIS/DI D/SOVA		X				
	19	D/SOVA		X				
	20			ļ				
	21			<u> </u>				
	22			<u> </u>				
		SUSPENSE	Date					
Remarks								

3637 (10-81)

STAT

20 Dec 85

SECRET

Executive Registry

85- 5004

20 December 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR: National Intelligence Officer for Strategic Programs

Chief, Arms Control Intelligence Staff, DI

FROM:

Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT:

Force Structure Information

I understand that from 1968 to date in strategic arms talks the United States has provided the information about the force structure for both sides. Is this still the case? If it is, it seems to me that it has us giving our intelligence and permitting the Soviets to know where we are good and where we are bad. Wouldn't it be proper and better for us to provide information about our force structure and ask the Soviets to do the same with respect to theirs? What is the rationale for doing it otherwise? I believe the same question pertains with respect to the MBFR negotiations.

William J. Casey

SECRET

25X1